

The CFIA

Much of the political protest during the past year has been focused on the Center for International Affairs (CFIA). What is so objectionable about that small, brick and ivy building on Divinity Ave.? Even a hasty sketch of the history and projects of the Center reveals why such "research in the social sciences" must be stopped.

The CFIA is modelled after the Center for International Studies (CIS) at MIT; both coordinate foreign area research, train U.S. and foreign diplomats, and advise governments on economic and military matters. The CIS was founded in 1951 primarily to study psychological techniques useful in the cold war. To this end, the CIA provided permanent funding, and both Harvard and MIT scholars participated.

In 1957 the CFIA was set up at Harvard. As an autonomous center, it has not received CIA funds but nonetheless does the same kind of research (with a shift in emphasis to Southeast Asia) and maintains the same intimate relations with the government. Pressure for the Center came from its first and present director, Robert R. Bowie, then Assistant Secretary of State under John Foster Dulles; one long-time friend, Dean McGeorge Bundy, insured its establishment and others like Raymond Vernon, Henry Kissinger, and Thomas Schelling joined the staff.

The projects of the CFIA are divided into three interlocking fields. Under "Development and Modernization" come topics like political stability or student politics in developing countries. Studies on the control of violence (domestic and international) fall within "Political-Military Strategy." Finally, "Atlantic and European Studies" have included Kissinger's search for ways to strengthen NATO relations.

The CFIA is an institution that brings together "scholars" to talk and to carry out project. Unfortunately, given the overlapping government-military-business interests represented in its funding and personnel, the Center produces ideas which maintain the international power of the United States at the expense of the majority of the world's people. This process of academic imperialism is documented and analyzed below.

THE DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY SERVICE

In many of today's countries, the majority of the people live on the borderline of health and subsistence. When half of all children born, die early in childhood and the rest are condemned to chronic malnutrition, something is wrong. The difficulty has been called "underdevelopment" and the solution has been seen as the imitation of the United States, with its impressive levels of technology and total economic output. Moreover, the route to this solution has been understood to include the injection of lumps of capital (generally from outside sources) and the training of the individuals in attitudes of entrepreneurship, that is, the competitive profit motive.

What is interesting about such a theory of development is that 1) it "coincidentally" benefits the direct economic interests of the United States by providing sites for highly profitable investments, 2) it envisions a globe covered with many smaller, less effective, but similar visions of our economic system and 3) it does not work. Those problems of health and subsistence are not characteristics of an isolated system which merely lacks sufficient capital and enterprising businessmen. Those "underdeveloped" countries are generally the former colonies of the West and as such, have the heritage of economies dominated by single crop or mineral exports. Within them, there is generally a rigid class structure - a small group of wealthy landlords who control the lives of the peasants and the few urban workers. The small group with control lives well, usually in ostentatious imitation of the West.

It is these and other institutions that must be changed before the lives of the majority are changed. However, it is also these institutions that constitute the political stability so cherished by development planners. Their plans depend on economic growth defined as profitable returns on investments of either foreign or domestic capital; such returns can be expected only under stable and favorable conditions, for example, cheap, plentiful labor, minimal taxation, and an infrastructure (roads, power, etc.) located in areas that benefits business rather than aiding the needs of the people. As long as foreign interests remain part of attempted "development," local resources will continue to be drained off and the same institutions will retain control.

It might be possible for the GNP of an underdeveloped country to rise through increased investment of capital. This, however, does not necessarily mean that the welfare of the general populace will be changed. Improvements in this direction cannot even begin until the goods and services already produced are redistributed. Only with socialism will the general welfare receive highest priority and control return to the people, both on the national level when foreign interests do not control the economy and on the local level when the people produce in order to satisfy their own desires. Such a solution is clearly not the objective of establishment planners from the United States, be they directly connected with the government, private industry, the university or all three.

The CFIA, through the Development Advisory Service (DAS), supplies these establishment planners to the underdeveloped countries. Operating on an annual budget of three million, the DAS provides economic advisors who help to plan and institute the direction of third world economies. DAS advisors operate within the upper levels of the national planning agency or finance ministry. The DAS's stated purpose may not be to further American interests and investments in the third world - but we can only examine the reality of 1) the specific governments the DAS chooses to support, 2) relations between the DAS and the U.S.

government, and 3) the economic policy suggested by the DAS. An examination of these three questions illustrates the supportive role the DAS plays in American imperialism.

The Countries

DAS teams are currently active in Colombia, Ghana, Indonesia, Liberia, Pakistan, and Malaysia. The Pakistan and Liberia teams may be reaching an end; to replace them the DAS is considering Ethiopia and Venezuela. The pattern of the countries involved is striking:

Ghana: after a Western backed coup, Kwame Nkrumah was overthrown.

Indonesia: after a military coup by General Sukarto, "eliminated" a half million communist sympathizers. Richard Nixon wrote in Foreign Affairs (October, 1967) "With its one hundred million people and its three thousand mile arc of islands containing the region's richest hoard of natural resources, Indonesia constitutes the greatest prize in the Southeast Asia area."

Pakistan: urban riots forced one dictator to resign, only to be replaced by another.

Malaysia: a key country in the American struggle for dominance in Southeast Asia. Urban rioting has forced the government to call upon the DAS for advisors on racial problems (as incredible and racist as that may seem). Samuel Huntington is leading a DAS team of political scientists to advise on "communal strife, racial balance, etc."

Venezuela: the location of most American investment in South America (oil).

More information on DAS operations in specific countries can be found in "Underdeveloping the World: The Role of the Development Advisory Service," available at the NAC office, PBH.

The DAS and the United States Government

The DAS does not work directly for the State Department. A convergence of interests, however, has produced such close cooperation that many DAS advisors have a past or present connection with the State Department (including Gustav Papanek, director of the DAS, who was kicked out of USAID, Agency for International Development, for being "too liberal" in the fifties). Security clearance from the State Department was required for all U.S. citizens working in Pakistan for the DAS from 1962 to 1965. The DAS's involvement in countries is often suggested by the American ambassador and/or AID director in that country. A portion of the DAS budget is met by AID funds. This close cooperation should not be surprising, since the DAS and the U.S. government are working toward the same basic ends -- a stable, capitalist third world dominated by American interests.

Funding

The Ford Foundation is the primary source of funding for DAS operations. Some money for specific projects also comes from USAID, the World Bank, the UN Development Program, and the countries involved. Much of the DAS's

funding and financial arrangements are made through the Institute of International Education. IIE coordinates a multitude of educational and cultural programs. In one of its promotional pamphlets, IIE explains its usefulness to the corporate elite:

In the last decade, U.S. corporations have expanded their direct foreign investments by 60% - to \$40 billion at the end of 1963. They recognize - abroad as well as at home - that education offers the best means for stimulating purchasing power, encouraging political stability, and most important of all, developing a reservoir of the trained manpower so necessary to their overseas operations. However, the U.S. corporation faces difficult decisions and alternatives in undertaking sound and profitable alternatives in international education. . . In approaching such problems, many corporations have benefited from the Institute's wide experience and counsel. (Services for the International Corporation, IIE)

IIE is funded by many private foundation, such as the Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller Foundations, and such known CIA conduit foundations such as the Asia Foundation, the William Benton Foundation, the Dearborn Foundation (solely funded by the CIA), the Rubicon foundation, and others. The list of corporate contributors is in fact a list of the top 100 U.S. corporations, including everyone from the Bank of America to General Motors to Standard Oil. Its trustee list includes many prominent member of the ruling class, men such as Ellsworth Bunker, Henry Cabot Lodge, Grayson Kirk, Jaun Tippe, Pres. of Pan Am, and closer to home, Douglas Dillon, a member of the visiting committee of the Harvard Economics Department and of the CFIA, several trustees of the Kennedy Library, and our very own Franklin L. Ford.

DAS advisors' contracts are signed jointly with Harvard and IIE. IIE handles arrangements for travel, makes out paychecks, and so forth. IIE and DAS can work together because they are working towards the same ends, and serving the same interests.

DAS Policy Recommendations

The DAS defends its involvement in third world countries by suggesting that an economic advisor is politically neutral. DAS advisors claim to help the various national economies become more efficient, without affecting political questions such as income distribution or the distribution of services. This position is rooted in the economic theory of capitalist societies. Supposedly, an economist structures the economy in such a way as to maximize efficiency. The political process starts from this "efficient" base and redistributes income in a socially desirable manner (through taxes, etc.). This theory ignores the fact that political power is primarily determined by distribution of wealth. The initial "efficient" distribution of income is thus a major determinant of the final distribution of income and the shape of the country's political institutions, for the form of economic development influences the growth of political policy and power.

The Role of the Development Advisors

The role that the DAS plays in underdeveloped countries is determined by the governments concerned. Obviously the DAS would not be permitted to give advice if its advice were consistently opposed to the interests of the government. DAS advice to Pakistan, (the largest and the longest running DAS project) has emphasized absolute growth of the economy over considerations of equity. Income inequality, between classes and between East and West Pakistan, has not significantly decreased. The benefits of economic growth in Pakistan have gone to the twenty families owning 66% of industrial assets, 70% of insurance funds, and 80% of bank assets (figures from Mahbub-ul Hag, a former CFIA Fellow and Chief economist of the Pakistan Planning Commission). DAS advisors serve to stabilize and rationalize economies.

From the point of view of the United States, stability is essential to foreign investment. Stability, should be taken to include the controlled development and rationalization of market economies. It is in this contest that development advisors have an important function in the operation of U.S. international economic policy.

A chaotic and totally backward economy is of little use to international business. A lack of infrastructure, arbitrary restrictions on trade, a poorly developed labor market, a government which cannot control the populace - these are traits of a society which limit the opportunities for investment.

In a society characterized by these traits the advisors have many functions. They run political training institutes to tool up the local civil service. They train the police and military in techniques to preserve law and order. They advise on the restructuring of village communities to improve labor mobility. There are jobs for social scientists in many disciplines.

The DAS operates in the more purely economic realm, usually in coordination with a local planning commission or finance ministry. The economic advisors suggest what are the proper government investment programs and what should be left to the private sector. They offer advice on the alteration of tariff policy, usually in the direction of opening the market to international competition.

Stability in the Third World is important not only because of its direct economic consequences. In several cases the immediate motivation of U.S. foreign policy seems political. Military alliances are formed, advisors are sent, ruling elites are supported where no significant economic interests are apparent. In some countries, even after U.S. political dominance is able to find few exploitable opportunities. Nonetheless, such cases still fit into the general picture. First, the interests of international business demand that the fight against communism be carried out on all fronts. Second, it is important that possible areas of business expansion be secured, though not all of them will immediately yield good investment opportunities.

To these countries also, the economic advisors are sent, and they serve the same general function. In short, U.S. economic advisors in poor countries help create and maintain a system in which international business can best function.

Hence it should be no surprise that Time magazine has just chosen Argentina and Colombia (the only Latin American countries with DAS involvement up to now) as the two Latin American countries with the most favorable conditions for foreign investment.

THE FELLOWS PROGRAM

The Fellows Program at the CFIA provides another link between the Center and the government. The program brings ten or fifteen public officials to Harvard each year to take advantage of the "finest" social scientist resources available. The majority of the Fellows come from the United States, but there are always several from other "free world" countries and from the third world countries in which the Center has research and DAS staffs. The Fellows remain on the government payroll with their extra expenses paid by the Ford Foundation, USAid, etc.

The Center provides the Fellows with a chance to get together in seminars and compare notes on how best to perform the jobs they are trying to do. Only men who can rise to "higher positions of responsibility" (CFIA annual report 1969) and put what they learn at the Center to good use are allowed to be Fellows. The Fellows each have a job to do and that job involves maintaining "international order." Research done by the Fellows is in reality information for protecting the status quo, i.e. to keep the United States on the top and to keep capitalism growing. The Fellows do not come to the Center to question whether or not their countries' policies benefit the people of the United States or of the third world.

A list of the Fellow's credentials for this year and previous years is damning in itself:

- O. Rudolph Aggrey, U.S. Program Manager of the International Motion and Television Service, United States Information Agency
- Vincent Brown, USAID deputy Director
- Colonel George Casey, U.S. Army Combat Developments Command, Fort Belvoir, Virginia
- Il Kwon Chung, Prime Minister of South Korea
- Major General Wendell Coats, Chief of Information, Department of the Army
- Captain Richard J. Davis, Assistant Director of the Politico-Military Policy Division of the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations
- Asafa Demissie, Ethiopia, Auditor-General of the Imperial Ethiopian Government
- Captain Dan T. Drain, Chief of Staff of the Command Service Force U.S. Pacific Fleet
- Brigadier General James Galloway, Assistant Division Commander, H.Q. American Division, Chou Lai, Republic of Vietnam

Bartlett Harvey, USAid deputy director, Ankara Turkey
Rear Admiral Frederick E. Janney, Director of Shore
Installations Division Office of the Chief of Naval
Operations
Lloyd Jonnes, USAid Saigon, Republic of Vietnam
Major General USAF Glenn A. Kent, Assistant to the Chief
of Staff for Studies and Analysis Headquarters, USAF
Wajid Ali Khan, Pakistan Member of the East Pakistan
Railway Board
Jacob Koop of Canada, Defense Research Board
Colonel Louis A. Kunzig, Deputy Director of European
Region for NATO affairs
Louis Marengo, Central Intelligence Agency
Willard C. Matthis, Central Intelligence Agency
Russell S. McClure, Director of USAID in Afghanistan
Colonel William T. Minor, Director of Simulation and
computers (SimCom), Industrial College of the Armed
Forces
Brigadier General Harold G. Moore, Office of the
Deputy Chief of Staff for military operations,
Department Of the Army Headquarters
Rear Admiral Charles D. Nace, Commander Submarine
Flotilla TWO
W. Haven North, Director, Office of Central/West African
Affairs for AID
Lewis M. Purnell, Political Counselor, U.S. embassy
in Indonesia
Vice Admiral Arnold F. Schade, Commander Submarine Force
Atlantic Fleet
Colonel Robert Schick, Assistant Manager of the Inter-
national Liaison of McDonnell-Douglas Corporation
Colonel John Smith, Director of Plans and Programs,
Air Force Advisory Group, Saigon
Kenneth Rabin, USAID Deputy Director, Office of Programs
Vietnam Bureau (1968-1969)

This Year's Fellows

Colonel Lewis Jordan Ashley, a career army officer,
Headquarters Department of the Army Staff from
1959-63, office of the Secretary of Defence from
1966-68. In 1969-70 he "plans to focus on a study
of the impact of change in society on a nation's
defense posture."
Johannes Balser, Germany, Ambassador in Malawi and in
1968-69 dealt with African Affairs in Bonn, author
of a study of the role of labor in the industrialization
of China. At the Center he plans to work on Foreign
Policy and Ideology.
John Gunther Dean, As a Foreign Service Officer, he
served during the 1950's in Belgium, France, Laos,
and Vietnam. He worked closely with the U.S.
delegation to Paris talks on Vietnam. His research
at the Center will focus on current French policy
toward Vietnam.
Bernard Jean Dorin, as a member of the French Foreign
Service he has served in Ottawa, at the United Nations
in New York, and most recently as diplomatic counsellor
to the French Ministers for Education and Scientific

Affairs. At the Center he plans to work on political problems relating to the nature of the newly emerging states of the world.

Richard W. Dye, served with the International Cooperation Administration in Washington from 1955 to 1956, and was a U.S. Foreign Service Officer from 1956 to 1961. Since 1961 he has been with the Ford Foundation - most recently as head of the Ford Foundation office for Malaysia and Singapore (1965-69). At the Center he is working on political problems of Southeast Asia with the focus on various regional concepts.

Anthony Gerald Hurrell, Development Administration and Training Department of the Ministry of Overseas Development (1966-68). Most recently served as head of the Ministry's West and North Africa Department.

Heyward Isham, Foreign Service Officer, he comes to the Center after a four-year assignment in the Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs of the Department of State where he was Deputy Director of the Vietnam Working Group.

Keijo T. Korhonen, Finland, has written three books about Finnish-Russian historical relations and a book about nuclear free zones in international politics, and plans to study the ways of modern politics and disarmament questions.

Earll Otto Krueger, Captain US Navy, Commander of a large operational jet training squadron in California.

Ruy Aguiar Da Silva Lme, Brazil, president of the Banco Central do Brasil and National Economic Council, now a professor of economics at the University of Sao Paulo.

Jagat Singh Mehta, India, Indian Foreign Service, He has had extensive and varied experience, including negotiation with the People's Republic of China, Hanoi, and other Southeast Asian capitals, and his work will focus on problems of Asia.

Kazuo Murakamy, Japan, Foreign Service, during the past year he has been engaged in research at the Japanese national Defence College, and will work on Asia and the United States.

Noi Emmanuel Omaboe, Ghana, was the Chairman, Economic Committee of the National Liberation Council, and Commissioner (Minister) of Economic Affairs. At the Center he will be working on Ghana's economic problems and stabilization policies.

Robert Jan van Schaik (Netherlands), director of European Economic Cooperation Affairs, lecturer on European integration at the University of Amsterdam.

William Baron Wheeler, USAid, served as Chief, Mediterranean and North African Loan Divisions and since 1966 has been with the U.S. Aid Mission in Nigeria. (Information from CFIA Annual Reports)

How writes a paper during his year at the Center. read "Australia's Security Choices in the 70's" discussion of how Australia and the United States will work together to deal with the threat of North

Vietnam and instability in South East Asia), and "Programs for Improved Politico-Military Capabilities in the Department



of State. Brigadier General Harold Moore has provided a study of how to fight guerilla warfare in his study of North Vietnam's General Giap in "Giap's Preachments and the Principles of War." In "An Uncertain Response" Colonel Smith astutely analyzes the Vietnam War and the problems of limited warfare. "American forces with their allies, larger in number than were employed in Korea...are locked in combat with a shrewd, tenacious and skillful enemy from a small and underdeveloped Asian country whose only goal is victory and whose only restraint is imposed by his opponents."

He operates on the assumption that guerilla warfare is a "tool for the teaching of Lenin and Mao," an instrument of "indirect strategy for communism." The communists brainwash the young men of the country and then the young men "return to their homes, where they begin to organize as a 'resistance movement'... Probably the most dangerous beginning to guerilla warfare, because it is so difficult to detect before armed conflict breaks out, appears when the Communists deliberately set out to subvert a country. Employed in this manner it becomes a deliberate form of conquest."

Colonel Smith's solution is to escalate the war as quickly as possible before the enemy can grow, to achieve a "meaningful threshold of destruction." He regrets that public debate is part of the American way for "the benefits to an opponent which derive from the disclosure, during public debate of the strategy and objectives of war can hardly be exaggerated."

In addition to fostering the military of this country, the Center also brings military officers from key world areas. Last year Colonel Sung Il Cho, Republic of Korea Aide to the Commander-in-Army UN Command, came to Cambridge to examine how the US and South Korea could cooperate most effectively in preventing Communist aggression in Southeast Asia. Colonel Sung Il Cho's paper shows that he is frighteningly out of touch with his people and in touch with the US military establishment. Having been saved by the US airforce in W.W. II, he believes the US must continue to save Korea and enlarge its military commitment, since South Korea can't possibly support its military by itself (Korean armed forces are the fourth largest in the world). "ROK's (Republic of Korea) dependence on the US is immutable both psychologically and materially. . . President Parks only talks of independence because he would have ROK attack the North (the US commitment is only to prevent aggression, not to take the offensive).

But the Koreans aren't the only ones to benefit from this military alliance. The U.S. gains because with its "complete knowledge of the ROK's systems and personnel, map deliveries and troop movements to a country such as Vietnam are greatly eased."

In spite of Korea's growing nationalist movement Colonel Sung Il Cho reports that the Koreans and the U.S. troops work together harmoniously. "The differences in their cultural backgrounds and in more mundane terms, in their pay scales, at a ratio of 100 to 1, have not seriously handicapped Korean

soldiers in maintaining cordial relationships with U.S. GIs in any unit. Exceptions have been isolated incidents such as sit-downs, demonstrations and hunger strikes in U.S. compounds. These have arisen mainly from insignificant emotional frictions between individuals of the two countries concerned. Both the ROK government and the US-ROK military authorities have been embarrassed when local newspapers magnified such incidents into 'racial discrimination', inhumanity, U.S. arrogance, etc."

John B. Robinson's (USAID deputy in Pakistan) 1969 paper "U.S. Foreign Aid Policy in the Seventies" exemplifies the prevailing attitude of the Fellows' papers (papers are on file in the CFIA library). Robinson is in the Henry Kissinger school of international relations.

We (U.S.) may have become tired, even bored, with the demands of leadership role and may want to share the burden with our Free world associates on some basis we would consider more equitable, but the mantle of leadership once accepted cannot be lightly cast aside. . . foreign aid will still occupy an important place in achieving our national purposes and implementing our foreign policy.

Robinson's paper is essentially a manual on how to keep the U.S. in command of the third world while allowing the third world to reform its institutions just enough to prevent it from exploding under economic and social oppression.

"From a U.S. foreign policy viewpoint, widespread and coincident revolutionary change in the LDCs (less developed country) as the rule rather than as the exception is not tolerable, particularly if there can be a viable alternative which will meet the needs and the will of the people of the LDCs. While recognizing that self-determination is a right, there is a more compelling U.S. policy requirement - that the international community of nations not be irreparably damaged. This is not an argument for status quo, but rather recognition that there is a tolerable and an intolerable limit of disruption. Therefore, what is required in most LDCs is a viable alternative - one which will bring about improvements reform and structural change at an acceptable pace... It would seem that political development in many, perhaps most LDCs will be accompanied by a degree of disruption; disorder even violence; but what must be questioned is the extent and intensity. What seems certain is that in all cases where the authoritarian regime is moderate and reform-minded, an opposition which resorts to disruptive or revolutionary methods does not enjoy majority support within the country ... In view of the prospective situation in LDCs we must seek a 'development alternative.' There must be a middle way and it is the burden of policy to find it... We must help LDCs find an alternative which may be better suited to their needs, which is better adapted to a process of structural change, is reformist and evolutionary, and is essentially peaceable and orderly... We must assume that there is a 'development alternative' and then in a 'development partnership' context we can proceed to consider the strategy and the measure necessary to bring it about."

The U.S. will hold the hand of the LDCs and lead them along the road to becoming developed countries; developed in a way that will not disrupt the security and power of the United States.

This year's Fellows haven't written their papers yet, but considering their affiliations, it seems very unlikely that their research will be any different.

A large number of the Fellows are either connected with AID or receive grants from it. Although less blatant than a connection with the defense department, AID is essentially the same thing: a method of control in the third world. AID functions to thwart change that might disrupt the "international order and thereby disrupt either business investments within the country or international trade."

The developing nations are of particular concern to the U.S. for as MacNamara (a member of the visiting committee of the CFIA) stated in 1966 "the years that lie ahead for the nations in the southern half of the globe are pregnant with violence. This would be true even if no threat of communist subversion existed -- as it clearly does ... the security of the U.S. is related to the security and stability of nations half a globe away." (NY Times, May 19, 1966). World peace maybe an admirable goal, but not if it is founded on an international arrangement that allows the U.S. to maintain excessive political and economic control over the third world. The U.S. has continually stressed "law and order" as a necessity for growth and change. This has meant that the military of South America and other third world countries have often been strengthened to promote a stable political position. USAid is often used to finance the training of military officers. The chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee: "Every critic of foreign aid can be confronted with the fact that the Armed forces of Brazil threw out the Goulart government and that U.S. military aid was a major factor in giving these forces an indoctrination in the principles of democracy and a pro-US orientation. Many of these officers were trained in the U.S. under the AID program." (Cong. record, May 24, 1965).

AID also serves the economic needs of the U.S. by acting as leverage which the U.S. can use to push for an open door policy for investment in and trade with underdeveloped countries. AID prods AID recipients to open up the market for U.S. imports. AID also used to obtain treaties to protect U.S. investments. This is done in connection with the Investment Guaranty Program which is administered through AID. The Investment Guaranty Program provides insurance for U.S. citizens and corporations investing abroad against losses from nationalization. This insurance program is not available for any country which does not sign an Investment Guaranty Treaty. AID sponsors certain U.S. exports to underdeveloped countries; acting in a sense as a business subsidy.

In Southeast Asia AID has acted essentially as the CIA. "In Laos, CIA men pass as the Agency for International Development's Rural Development Annex. President Nixon's own Commission on foreign aid ignores such unpleasant facts. . . ." (New Republic, March 21, 1970)

Proposals for scrapping AID have been brought forth in Congress, since AID has not been well liked in many countries. However, it is unlikely that AID will die easily and if it should be eliminated, that whatever replaces it will be any better. Early in March the White house issued the Peterson report urging the end of AID. The report favored "not less U.S. aid but less visibility in the administration of aid." (Newsweek, March 23, 1970) However, the dismantling of Aid is meeting strong opposition in Congress. Secretary Rogers and others are hesitant to lose the control over foreign affairs that AID provides (albeit somewhat inefficiently these days). "The consensus in Washington, in short is that there may be a reorganization aimed at lessening the political baggage attached to aid and de-emphasizing efforts to indoctrinating the recipients with the 'American way of life.' But AID is expected to survive even if under another Republican devised acronym, and together with Congress, State will keep its control." (Newsweek)

It would therefore seem clear that what is billed as neutral social sciences at Harvard is in fact working against the interests of the people of the Third World. The CFIA instead serves the Kissingers and the Rostows and in doing so perpetuates the mechanism that has created the war in Southeast Asia.

- 1 - control of study - U.
- 2 - choice of govt.
- 3 -
- 4 - other good things

H-R NAC

